

ATLANTIS

This is ATLANTIS, a journal of postal Diplomacy, edited and published by Deborah and Christopher Schleicher, 5122 W. Carmen Ave., Chicago, Illinois 60630.

ATLANTIS is affiliated with the IFW Diplomacy Society. The editor is a member of The Diplomacy Association.

Subscriptions to ATLANTIS are \$1.50 for 10 issues. There are no games opening at the present time.

"Fall 1908"

1970AJ

R-2

FRANCE FALLS!!!

FRANCE (CD):	<u>A Par [holds]</u> [Dislodged & annihilated]
ITALY (CD):	F Lyo [holds]
GERMANY (CD):	A Ber [holds]
ENGLAND (Lakofka):	F Nth (C) A Yor-Bel A Yor-Bel <u>F Bar-Nwy</u> F Swe (S) F Bar-Nwy F Eng-Mid F Bre holds A Bur-Par A Gas (S) A Bur-Par A Kie (S) A Mun F Bal (S) GERMAN A Ber <u>A Mun (S) TURKISH A Gal-Boh [NSO]</u> <u>F Spa (sc) War</u> F Mid-Por
TURKEY (Jordan):	<u>A StP-Nwy</u> A Fin (S) A StP-Nwy A Liv-Mos <u>A Gal-Sil</u> A Bul-Sev <u>A Apu (S) A StP-Nwy [Illegal]</u> <u>F Tus-Lyo</u> F Tyr-Wes F Ion-Tun F Bla (C) A Bul-Sev

"Fall 1908"

1970AJ

R-2

AUSTRIA (Leahey):

A Pru (S) GERMAN A Ber
F Adr (C) TURKISH A Anu-Alb [NSO]
F Nap (S) TURKISH F Ion-Tyr [NSO]
A Pie-Mar
A Boh-Mun
A Tyr (S) A Boh-Mun
A Sil (S) GERMAN A Ber

Underlined moves do not succeed. NSO -- Not So Ordered.

SUPPLY CENTER CHART:

FRANCE (CD): ~~Ppt.~~ (O)
GERMANY (CD): Ber. (1) No change.
ITALY (CD): ~~Tyr, Ppt.~~ (O) Remove F Lyo.
ENGLAND (Lakofka): Edi, Liv, Lon, Den, Nwy, Bel, Hol, Bre, Kie, Swe, Spa,
Mar, Mun, Por, Par. (15) Build 2.
TURKEY (Jordan): Ank, Smy, Con, Sev, Mos, Gre, Rom, StP, War, Rum, Tun. (11)
Build 1.
AUSTRIA (Leahey): Bud, Vie, Tri, Ser, Bul, Ven, Nap. (7) No change.

Builds are due 18 February 1972. Gain -- ~~Lpss~~.

~~~~~

#### THE CONVOY ORDER, REVISITED

by

John J. Beshara

In my original article, "The Convoy Order," published in ATLANTIS #46, I am responsible for a typographical error in the following sentence:

"According to Section X, as quoted, A Lon-Bel does cut the support of F Belgium because A London is attacking 'from a space different from the one into which' F Belgium is giving support."

That sentence should read:

"According to Section X, as Quoted, A Ruhr does cut the support of F Belgium because A Ruhr is attacking 'from a space different from the one into which' F Belgium is giving support."

The Rulebook does state in Paragraph 5 of Section XII the support is not cut by A London, even though the Rulebook does not indicate the direction from which A London is attacking -- whether from London or the English Channel. For, the direction of the attack of A London is superfluous to Paragraph 5 of Section XII. Since we do not know the direction of the attack of A London, we do not know if support is cut by A London in accordance with Section X.

Mr. Boyer is correct in stating my contentions are grammatical. It is assumed since Section XII refers only to convoy orders, it does not affect non-convoys units such as A Ruhr in Example 3 of my initial article. It is also

assumed in Section X support of any unit is cut when dislodged from any space, even though a unit dislodged by a convoyed army is not specifically indicated by word or example and even though Paragraph 5 of Section XII specifically states "support is not cut." There is your paradox, Mr. Boyer and Mr. Walker, because the following sentences of the Rulebook constitute a direct contradiction:

1. Section X: "If a unit ordered to support...is dislodged from any space, including the one into which it is giving support, then its support is 'cut.'"
2. Section XII, Paragraph 5: "If a convoyed army attacks a fleet which is supporting a fleet which is attacking one of the convoying fleets, that support is not cut."

It is obvious Mr. Calhamer did not intend the text of Section XII, Paragraph 5, to abort Section X or to supercede Section X, but only to delineate the example. For this reason I recommend in my article that Gamesmasters should add to the text the phrase, "by the convoyed army, unless the supporting fleet is dislodged."

Examples 1 and 2 in my original article are not new. Prior to the publication of the 1971 Rulebook, I made known my desire for rules resolving ambiguity in these adjudications. I do think I have adjudicated them, as well as Examples 3 and 4, as Mr. Calhamer wishes and as I believe they should be adjudicated according to the Rulebook.

Of the four examples I presented, Mr. Boyer disputes my adjudication of Example 1, Mr. Walker agreed with my adjudication of Example 2 in GRAUSTARK #255 but disputed it three weeks later in ATLANTIS #47, and Chris Schleicher disagrees with the adjudication of Example 4. This does give one pause to contemplate how a stranger to postal Diplomacy can cope with these problems without the benefit of having heard about Brannan's Rule!

For those who may not have a copy of my previous article, the examples are:

Example 1

ENGLAND: A Edi-Hol, F Nth C A Edi-Hol, A Bel S A Edi-Hol, F Eng S F Nth.

GERMANY: F Hol-Nth, F Den S F Hol-Nth.

Example 2

ENGLAND: A Lon-Bel, F Eng C A Lon-Bel, F Nth S A Lon-Bel.

FRANCE: F Bel-Eng, F Bre S F Bel-Eng.

Example 3

ENGLAND: A Lon-Bel, F Eng C A Lon-Bel, F Nth S A Lon-Bel.

FRANCE: F Bre-Eng, F Bel S F Bre-Eng.

GERMANY: A Ruh-Bel, A Hol S A Ruh-Bel.

Example 4

ENGLAND: A Edi-Hol, F Nth C A Edi-Hol, A Bel S A Edi-Hol, F Eng S F Nth.

GERMANY: F Den-Nth, F Hol S F Den-Nth.

#####

Circus' passports: "The Circus was found to contain several thousand Kaiser kewpie dolls filled with contaminated horse chestnuts from the Black Forest. Also many came complete with removable spiked helmets. The Premier naturally classified such prizes as potentially harmful or fatal should they fall into the hands of unsuspecting Frenchmen."

London; 4 August 1902:

A Royal investigation today revealed that, as everyone suspected all along, Heaven is indeed in Sweden. Extensive research was done in Canada, where such sayings as, 'They can do it in Sweden, but it'll never work here,' and, 'Face it, they're just better than us,' are quite common. The commission, under Sir Lance Lot, carried out a thorough check of Swedish politics, which were found to be quite celestial. 'Ahermhungyaah!' said Sir Lance Lot. He also noted the remarkable facility of the Swedee to be on both sides of the fence at the same time, a policy hitherto practiced only by God. Careful scrutiny of certain Swedish movies was the clincher for the Heaven theory.

London; 5 August 1902:

A certain cinema in London:

The Prime Minister today announced a Holy Crusade to Sweden. "Now everyone knows that God is English, thus it is only logical, fair and Christian that Sweden and England should be one and the same country. This will, of course, necessitate the removal of certain Ruseian pagane, but, with God on our side, as usual, we can't really lose, now, can we?" he pronounced.

Rome; 31 October 1902:

The Italian government today was able to reciprocate the Austrian government's favor of allowing the 3000 man Italian Olympic ski team to exercise in the Tyrolian Alps. 150 Italian Infantrymen presented the City of Budapest with a great 400-lb. pumpkin. As the detachment left, the populace could be seen slicing up the pumpkin and wach other.

Vienna; 13 October 1902:

The Emperor today called upon all citizens to stand fast against the invaders on the Western Front. All male citizens between the ages of 18 and 51 have been mobilized. It is rumored that a detachment of Rough Riders has been sent by the United States as a means of stabilizing the military situation in the area. When interviewed, the Emperor has only two things to say: "We will take any help we can get!" and "By the way, where and what is the United Statee?" The Emperor was lead away by aides.

R-6, 1971DF

Rome; 20 January 1902:

A foul plot was thwarted today wherein the French ambassador and certain elements of the Privy Council sought to involve Italy in a war with Austria, while France prepared a staggering blow in the West. King Victor Emmanuel foreshortened his tour of the U.S. in order to return to Rome and punish the plotters. He was dismayed to find that in his absence, an attack had been ordered against Austria; and a pact negotiated with France. The pact, in addition to being illegal, has actually been violated by the announced French moves into Marseilles and more particularly into the Gulf of Lyon. This, coupled with His Majesty's desire for peace with Franz Josef, dictated a withdrawal from Tyrolia and a "protective reaction" in the West. The King was quoted as saying: "Do the French really have so low an estimate of Italian intelligence as to



support of army Belgium. Opposing that unit, the unit in Holland (a fleet) was moving with the support (of fleet Denmark) into the space from which the attack came.

And, that is the point I wish to make for the Novice (and some of the more experienced) players.

But the part where:

GERMANY: f den-nse, f hol s f den-nse.

raises a question. Clearly, since fleet Holland is not being supported in place (and has not been ordered to move), then a two-on-one attack would dislodge it.

Now, the attack that could dislodge fleet Holland, in this case, is the attacking army (Edinburgh). That attack is valid if and only if the convoying fleet (North Sea) is not dislodged. And, fleet North Sea is being supported in place by fleet English Channel, and that support has not been cut.

Then, clearly, this second set of German orders would result in fleet Holland being dislodged by the attacking (convoyed) army.

### Example 3

ENGLAND: a lon-bel, f enc C a lon-bel, f nse s a lon-bel.

FRANCE: f bre-enc, f bel s f bre-enc.

GERMANY: a ruh-bel, a hol s a ruh-bel.

Now, the French fleet Belgium is unsupported in place, so normally, the supported attack on Belgium would succeed in dislodging the French fleet Belgium. And, the attack from Ruhr cut the support of French fleet Belgium, hence the English fleet English Channel is not dislodged. In that case, normally, the convoy would succeed.

The supported attack of the army (London) onto Belgium is stood off by the supported attack of the army (Ruhr) onto Belgium, hence the convoy fails for this reason alone (in this example).

Notice, that in John's example, the French fleet Belgium was not dislodged. Now, I am not at all convinced that four units attacking an unsupported unit, should not dislodge that lone unit. And, this is why LA GUERRE House Rules presently are written to rule that, in this case, the French fleet Belgium is dislodged and must retreat, although the standoff still occurs, and (again in LA GUERRE) Belgium is vacant after the moves are resolved. But in most other magazines, this is given a famous name, and the unit in Belgium is allowed to stand.

Now, John states, "According to Section X, as quoted, A Lon-Bel does cut the support of F Belgium because A London is attacking "from a space different from the one into which" F Belgium is giving support."

I disagree. Fleet Belgium is giving support into the English Channel. The attacking army is coming, not from London, but from the last space of the convoy, namely, the English Channel. Truly, the support given by fleet Belgium was cut, not from the attacking army (London), but by the attacking army Ruhr.

John continues by quoting ONLY FOUR WORDS from Section XII: "But Section XII

conflicts with Section X by stating the "support is not cut" by either A. London or A. Ruhr." I agree with John when he hopes that Mr. Calhauer intended to indicate the exception to Section X and that the support is not cut by the convoyed army.

### Example 4

ENGLAND: a edi-hol, f nse C a edi-hol, a bels a edi-hol, f enc s f nse.

GERMANY: f den-nse, f hol s f den-nse.

According to paragraph 5 of Section XII, fleet Holland can give support because its support cannot be cut by the convoyed army.

They convoying fleet is not the attacking unit. Further, in this example, the convoying fleet has not been dislodged. Hence the convoy is valid. And, then, fleet Holland has indeed been attacked "from the side."

In the simpler case where fleet North Sea attacks fleet Holland, and fleet Holland supports fleet Denmark to the North Sea, then the support given by fleet Holland is not cut since the attack did not come "from the side"; i.e., the attack comes from the space into which the supporting unit is giving support.

Now, if the rule is written so that SUPPORT OF FLEET HOLLAND CAN NOT BE CUT BY AN ATTACK FROM A SPACE INTO WHICH FLEET HOLLAND IS GIVING SUPPORT, then support can not be cut from the convoyed army.

You see, it is all in the (proper) use of the language. The writers of this new rulebook obviously did not make such achievements. (I hear that Rod Walker gave a major contribution to that version of the rulebook, so no wonder).

John's recommendation to Gamesmasters to "interpret Section XII to mean the support is not cut by the convoyed army, unless the supporting fleet is dislodged" would not be valid if the wording which I proposed above is adopted by the Gamesmasters in their House Rules.

[illegible]

[And yet another article, this one from Rod Walker, 4719 Felton St., San Diego, California 92116.]

GOOD GRIEF

...Rod Walker

There are times when the obvious escapes the viewer. In replying to John Beshara's article ("The Convoy Order") in ATLANTIS 46, I overlooked the most obvious deficiency in the whole thing. I have already dealt with the putative paradox and its nonexistence. You and I are agreed here that, whether we like the rulings or not, the Rulebook is quite consistent.

But back in John's examples 1 and 2, an astounding paradox does occur. This is the paradox of John's talking out of both sides of his mouth at once. That happens to us all, now and then, when we are in a hurry to make a point.

First the examples:  
[Page 10]

### Example 1

ENGLAND: A Edi-Hol, F Nth C A Edi-Hol, A Bel S A Edi-Hol, F Eng S F Nth.

GERMANY: F Hol-Nth, F Den S F Hol-Nth.

### Example 2

ENGLAND: A Lon-Bel, F Eng C A Lon-Bel, F Nth S A Lon-Bel.

FRANCE: F Bel-Eng, F Bre S F Bel-Eng.

Why the ruling in #1? Says John, "Because two opposing units are attempting to move with equal support into and out of Holland via the North Sea, a standoff occurs." Good. I agree.

Now look at #2. Take that same sentence, and change the location names where appropriate: "Because two opposing units are attempting to move with equal support into and out of Belgium via the English Channel, a standoff occurs." That's the same rule, isn't it? But does John make the same ruling? No! He suddenly shifts ground and declares that since the army has only one support the convoying fleet is dislodged.

In short, in Example 1, John says the fleet stands off the army, but in Example 2, he says the army does not stand off the fleet. I submit that elementary logic would demand that if he applies the ruling of #1 in that situation, he must apply it in #2.

My ruling in Example 2 (F Bel-Eng fails) is based on Brannan's Rule, which John appears to quote and which you accept. If the army is coming from the direction of the (last) convoying fleet, then if the attacking army and the attacking fleet have equal support, they must stand each other off.

In order to accept your ruling (and John's) in Example 2 above, I think you will have to reject Brannan's Rule, and regard the convoyed exchange of units as just one of those peculiar little things Allan Calhamer stuck in to keep you on your toes.

This allows you, however, to accept Examples 1 and 2 (and Example 13 in the Rulebook) with perfect consistency -- almost. In Example 1, F Nth is not dislodged because it is supported by F Eng. In Example 2 (as in Example 13 of the Rulebook), the convoyed army does not protect the convoying fleet(s). As I said Earlier, Allan had originally created Rule XII.5 to rule in something like Example 2 the way in which you and John both do.

But then you must come to grips with Example 1. If you rule that the Fleet stands off the Army, how come in Example 2 the Army doesn't stand off the fleet? "Well," you assert, "the convoyed army does not protect the convoying fleet." Rule XII.5 thus appears as an exception to the Rulebook, a Rule which overthrows, deus ex machina, one of the Rulebook's basic principles, a principle which that Rule helped to establish in the first place.

That's almost consistency. I can accept the rationale behind it (even if I don't agree with it). But this rationale has to be phrased in the narrowest and most precise of terms.

John's ruling in Example 1 ("Because two opposing units...") is phrased in the broadest possible terms, and invalidates his ruling in Example 2. Your ruling is narrower and at least nearly consistent.

I Believe, however, that what is sauce for the goose is sace for the gander, and if you allow the attacking fleet in Example 1 to stand off the convoyed army, in all fairness you must concede as much to the army -- that is, that it can stand off the fleet.

It is obvious that there are two positions on this point, and there probably always will be, because each side has some piece of the argument. I suspect



